

September 30, 1992 LB 11

ahead of us, and it's going to be a lot bigger problem in all likelihood. I will not be surprised if the Forecast Board comes in when they meet with a reduced number for anticipated receipts next year, at least less than what we're now anticipating on the average, the growth the way the planning document that the Appropriations Committee passed out assumes, which I'm not critical of, but I think it's excellent, but we tend not to look ahead. I guess my position is if you don't want to make a long-term cut that has some meaning, you just as well not do it at all so you can come back in next time and make the cut that is meaningful. I would oppose Senator Schellpeper's amendment. If it's adopted, I just as soon vote against the bill because it becomes a relatively meaningless document in the long-term impact of trying to balance receipts and expenditures that we're going to be faced with.

SPEAKER BAACK: Thank you, Senator Warner. Senator Haberman.

SENATOR HABERMAN: Mr. President and members of the body, the state lives off of the income tax and sales tax. We do not cut the income tax or the sales tax or raise the income tax or the sales tax. We're talking about the cigarette tax. Now it's okay to take the cigarette tax and build a new basketball court, that's fine. Don't cut that in those days or whatever, but we're going to have a new basketball court because they said give me a new basketball court and I'll give you a winning team. We build buildings with the cigarette money. We serve cancer with the cigarette money. So what we did with the cigarette money one year we said, well, let's take some of it and give it back to the cities. Everybody thought that was a pretty good idea. So the city took the money and they spent it which they're supposed to do. They hired people. So this is a loss to some of those cities. Well, Lincoln loses \$248,000. Omaha loses \$434,000; Ogallala, \$6,592; Holdrege, \$7,000; North Platte, \$29,000; South Sioux City, \$12,500; Seward, \$7,000; Scottsbluff, \$17,000; Plattsmouth, over \$8,000 and LaVista, \$12,000. They lose this money. They've hired people, they've started projects so how are they going to keep on with these projects? Are they going to say we're going to cut out the service? No, they're not going to say that. On a local level, it's much easier to say that on the state level than it is on a local level. They're going to increase taxes, and I don't blame them. If I was on the local level and I had a program I put in and I was paying for it, I wouldn't want to increase the taxes, but I would if I had to and they're going to